



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/666,930	09/19/2003	Warren M. Famworth	2269-5529US (02-0766.00/U)	6453
24247	7590	10/10/2006	EXAMINER	
TRASK BRITT P.O. BOX 2550 SALT LAKE CITY, UT 84110			ISAAC, STANETTA D	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2812	

DATE MAILED: 10/10/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/666,930

Applicant(s)

FARNWORTH ET AL.

Examiner

Stanetta D. Isaac

Art Unit

2812

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 July 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-14 and 25-39 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-14 and 25-39 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 19 September 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>4/20/06, 8/03/06 & 9/21/06</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

This Office Action is in response to the Remarks filed on 7/10/06. Currently, claims 1-14 and 25-39 are pending.

Information Disclosure Statement

8/03/06 and 9/1/06

The information disclosure statement (IDS) ^{were} ~~was~~ submitted on 4/20/06, ^{was} filed after the mailing date of the Office Action on 4/06/06. The submission is in compliance with the provisions of 37 CFR 1.97. Accordingly, the information disclosure statement is being considered by the examiner.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

The rejection of claims 1, 2, 4-14, 25, and 29-34 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Okamoto et al., US Patent 6,680,241 has been maintained for reasons of record.

Okamoto discloses the semiconductor method as claimed. See figures 1A-5, and corresponding text, where Okamoto teaches, pertaining to claim 1, a method for supporting wafers for singulation and pick-and-place, comprising: providing a semiconductor wafer 1 (figure 3A; col. 4, lines 45-51); mounting an adhesive-coated tape 35 to a surface of the

Art Unit: 2812

semiconductor wafer (figure 3B; col. 4, lines 55-62); gripping the semiconductor wafer along at least a portion of the periphery thereof (figure 3B; col. 4, lines 55-62, *Note*: the Examiner takes the position that, the wafer sheet (implied adhesive-coated tape), as taught by Okamoto, is bonded to the silicon wafer, as a result, gripping the back surface of the silicon wafer is obtained); singulating individual components from the semiconductor wafer, leaving a ring of material comprising at least in part a material of the semiconductor wafer along the periphery thereof (figures 3B and 1E-1G; col. 3, lines 1-28; col. 4, lines 55-62; *Note*: the Examiner takes the position that the wafer sheet is used without a frame and that the portion of the wafer sheet extending away from the silicon wafer is the ring of material); and removing at least some of the individual components from the adhesive-coated tape (figures 3B and 1E-1G; col. 4, lines 1-28 col. 4, lines 55-62 *Note*: the Examiner takes the position that all of the individual components, as taught by Okamoto, are removed from the wafer sheet (implied adhesive-coated tape)). In addition, Okamoto teaches, pertaining to claim 2, wherein gripping the semiconductor wafer along at least a portion of the periphery thereof further includes gripping the semiconductor wafer by the ring of material during the removing of the at least some individual components (figure 3B; col. 4, lines 55-62). Also, Okamoto teaches, pertaining to claim 4, further including forming at least a portion of the ring of material from a polymer material disposed about and contiguous with a periphery of the semiconductor wafer and of thickness at least as great as a thickness of the semiconductor wafer (figure 1E; col. 3, lines 65-67; col. 3, lines 1-9; col. 4, lines 61-62). Okamoto teaches, pertaining to claim 5, further including forming the ring of material in part from the material of the semiconductor wafer and in part from a polymer disposed about and contiguous with a periphery of the semiconductor wafer and of thickness at least as great as a

Art Unit: 2812

thickness of the semiconductor wafer (figure 1E; col. 3, lines 65-67; col. 3, lines 1-9; col. 4, lines 61-62). In addition, Okamoto teaches, pertaining to claim 6, further comprising the ring of material from the polymer material by one of spin-coating, stereolithography or molding (col. 3, lines 12-17, spin-coating). Also, Okamoto teaches, pertaining to claim 7, further comprising backgrinding the semiconductor wafer prior to singulating (col. 4, lines 57-60). Okamoto teaches, pertaining to claim 8, further comprising mounting the adhesive-coated tape to an active surface of the semiconductor wafer and singulating the semiconductor wafer from a backside thereof after backgrinding (figure 3B; col. 4, lines 57-60). In addition, Okamoto teaches, pertaining to claim 9, further comprising mounting the adhesive-coated tape to a backside of the semiconductor wafer and singulating the semiconductor wafer from an active surface thereof (col. 4, lines 55-62). Also, Okamoto teaches, pertaining to claim 10, further comprising mounting the adhesive-coated tape to a backside of the semiconductor wafer and singulating the semiconductor wafer from an active surface thereof (col. 4, lines 55-62). Okamoto teaches, pertaining to claim 11, wherein mounting the adhesive-coated tape comprises mounting a tape bearing a UV-sensitive adhesive thereon (col. 3, lines 20-28). In addition, Okamoto teaches, pertaining to claim 12, further comprising exposing the UV-sensitive adhesive prior to removing the at least some individual components, while leaving a portion on the adhesive-coated tape extending over the ring of material unexposed (col. 3, lines 20-28). Also, Okamoto teaches, pertaining to claim 13, wherein the semiconductor wafer is singulated using one of laser cutting, water cutting and sawing (col. 4, lines co-54, *Note*: the Examiner takes the position that it is inherent that at least one of the conventionally used singulation steps is performed since Okamoto teaches dicing the silicon wafers along scribed lines). Finally, Okamoto teaches,

Art Unit: 2812

pertaining 14, further comprising discarding the ring of material, any remaining individual components and the adhesive-coated tape after removing the at least some individual components (figure 1G; col. 24-27).

Okamoto teaches, pertaining to claim 25, a method for processing a semiconductor wafer, comprising: mounting an adhesive-coated tape 30 to a surface of a semiconductor wafer 1 (figure 3A; col. 4, lines 45-47); and singulating individual components from the semiconductor wafer and removing at least some singulated individual components without using a film frame while the adhesive-coated tape is mounted to the surface thereof (figure 3B; col. 4, lines 50-62).

Okamoto teaches, pertaining to claim 29, a method of processing a semiconductor wafer, comprising: gripping a semiconductor wafer along at least a portion of a periphery thereof figure 3B; col. 4, lines 55-62, *Note*: the Examiner takes the position that, the wafer sheet (implied adhesive-coated tape), as taught by Okamoto, is bonded to the silicon wafer, as a result, gripping the back surface of the silicon wafer is obtained); and singulating individual components from the semiconductor wafer while leaving an uncut peripheral ring of material comprising at least in part a material of the semiconductor wafer thereabout (col. 4, lines 55-62). In addition, Okamoto teaches, pertaining to claim 30, further including removing at least some singulated individual components therefrom (figures 3B and 1E-1G; col. 4, lines 1-28 col. 4, lines 55-62 *Note*: the Examiner takes the position that all of the individual components, as taught by Okamoto, are removed from the wafer sheet (implied adhesive-coated tape)). Also, Okamoto teaches, pertaining to claim 31, wherein gripping a semiconductor wafer along at least a portion of a periphery thereof further includes gripping the uncut peripheral ring of material while removing the at least some singulated individual components therefrom (figures 3B and 1E-1G;

Art Unit: 2812

col. 4, lines 1-28 col. 4, lines 55-62 *Note*: the Examiner takes the position that all of the individual components, as taught by Okamoto, are removed from the wafer sheet (implied adhesive-coated tape)). Okamoto teaches, pertaining to claim 32, further comprising defining the uncut peripheral ring of material from semiconductor material (figure 1E; col. 3, lines 65-67; col. 3, lines 1-9; col. 4, lines 61-62). In addition, Okamoto teaches, pertaining to claim 33, further comprising defining the uncut peripheral ring of material at least in part from polymer disposed about and contiguous with the semiconductor wafer (figure 1E; col. 3, lines 65-67; col. 3, lines 1-9; col. 4, lines 61-62). Finally, Okamoto teaches, pertaining to claim 34, further comprising defining the uncut peripheral ring of material in part from semiconductor material and in part from a polymer disposed about and contiguous with a periphery of the semiconductor wafer (figure 1E; col. 3, lines 65-67; col. 3, lines 1-9; col. 4, lines 61-62).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The rejection of claim 3 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Okamoto et al., US Patent 6,680,241 in view of Tandy et al., Patent Application Publication US 2003/0003688 has been maintained for reasons of record.

Art Unit: 2812

Okamoto discloses the semiconductor method substantially as claimed. See Okamoto discloses the semiconductor method substantially as claimed. See preceding rejection of claims 1, 2, 4-14, 25, and 29-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e).

However, Okamoto fails to show, pertaining to claim 3, further including forming the ring of material only from the material of the semiconductor wafer.

Tandy teaches, in figure 1A, and corresponding text, forming a ring of material only from the material of the semiconductor wafer.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate, forming a ring of material only from the material of the semiconductor wafer, in the method of Okamoto, pertaining to claim 3, according to the teachings of Tandy, with the motivation that, manufacturing individual integrated circuits from a large semiconductor wafer will typically have a ring of material formed of the semiconductor wafer, as a result, would result in routine experimentation.

The rejection of claims 26-28 and 35-39 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Okamoto et al., US Patent 6,680,241 in view of Oka US Patent 6,551,906 has been maintained for reasons of record.

Okamoto discloses the semiconductor method substantially as claimed. See preceding rejection of claims 1, 2, 4-14, 25, and 29-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e).

However, Okamoto fails to show, pertaining to claims 26, 35, 38 and 39, wherein the semiconductor wafer is a 300 mm semiconductor wafer and further including handling the 300 mm semiconductor wafer using equipment sized to handle 200 mm semiconductor wafers. In

Art Unit: 2812

addition, Okamoto fails to show, pertaining to claims 27 and 36 further including singulating the 300 mm semiconductor wafer using a 200 mm semiconductor wafer saw chuck. Finally, Okamoto fails to show, pertaining to claims 28 and 37, further including holding the 300 mm semiconductor wafer in a 200 mm semiconductor wafer pick-and-place machine chuck while removing the at least some singulated individual components therefrom.

Oka teaches, in figures 1A-7H, and corresponding text, a similar method where conventionally the semiconductor wafers are grinded to a desired thickness of 300 mm prior to singulation (col. 1, lines 19-66; col. 2, lines 9-15).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate the following steps: wherein the semiconductor wafer is a 300 mm semiconductor wafer and further including handling the 300 mm semiconductor wafer using equipment sized to handle 200 mm semiconductor wafers; further including singulating the 300 mm semiconductor wafer using a 200 mm semiconductor wafer saw chuck; further including holding the 300 mm semiconductor wafer in a 200 mm semiconductor wafer pick-and-place machine chuck while removing the at least some singulated individual components therefrom, in the method of Okamoto, pertaining to claims 26-28, according to the teachings of Oka, with the motivation of conventionally preparing the semiconductor wafer for further packaging processing techniques such as chip formation. In addition, since the semiconductor wafer size is 300 mm the advantage would be greater production in the number of chips produced, resulting in an improvement of throughput chip manufacturing. Finally, since Oka teaches, that the semiconductor wafers are conventionally formed at a size of 300 mm, having equipment to accommodate handling a wafer of this size is obviously well known in the art of semiconductor manufacturing.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 7/10/06 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. The Applicant raises the clear issue as whether Okamoto alone or in combination thereof, suggest gripping the semiconductor wafer along at least a portion of a periphery thereof, leaving a ring of material comprising at least in part a material of the semiconductor wafer along the periphery thereof.

The Examiner takes the position that Okamoto alone or in combination thereof, does suggest, in the claims broadest interpretation, gripping the semiconductor wafer along *at least* a portion of a periphery thereof, leaving a ring of material comprising *at least in part of* the semiconductor a long the periphery thereof. Specifically, Okamoto teaches, that *at least a portion* of the semiconductor wafer is gripped by the wafer sheet (implied adhesive-coated tape) (see figures 3B and 1E-1G; col. 3, lines 1-28; col. 4, lines 55-62, where it states that the wafer sheet can be used *without* a frame). In addition, since the Examiner takes the position that the wafer is *only* gripped by the wafer sheet, the portion of the wafer sheet (see figure 3A) extended from the wafer is in fact the ring of material (figure 3A represents a cross-sectional view of the semiconductor wafer and wafer sheet).

In response to applicant's argument that the examiner's conclusion of obviousness is based upon improper hindsight reasoning, it must be recognized that any judgment on obviousness is in a sense necessarily a reconstruction based upon hindsight reasoning. But so long as it takes into account only knowledge which was within the level of ordinary skill at the time the claimed invention was made, and does not include knowledge gleaned only from the

Art Unit: 2812

applicant's disclosure, such a reconstruction is proper. See *In re McLaughlin*, 443 F.2d 1392, 170 USPQ 209 (CCPA 1971).

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Stanetta D. Isaac whose telephone number is 571-272-1671. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 9:30am -6:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael Lebentritt can be reached on 571-272-1873. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2812

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Stanetta Isaac
Patent Examiner
September 30, 2006



MICHAEL LEBENTRITT
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER